



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

CR

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,758	09/04/2001	Vadim Y. Banine	P 282980 P-0202.011-US	8495
909	7590	09/29/2006	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP P.O. BOX 10500 MCLEAN, VA 22102			NGUYEN, LAM S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2853

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/943,758

Applicant(s)

BANINE ET AL.

Examiner

LAM S. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2853

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/942,953.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/01/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-12, 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. (EP 1020897 A1) in view of Klebanoff et al. (US 6533952).

Referring to claims 1, 10, 15, 17:

Tanaka et al. discloses a lithographic projection apparatus comprising:

- a radiation system to supply a projection beam of radiation (*FIG. 4, element CA*);
- a support structure adapted to support patterning structure which can be used to pattern the projection beam according to a desired pattern (*FIG. 4, element R*);
- a substrate table to hold a substrate (*FIG. 4, elements WS*);
- a projection system to project the patterned beam onto a target portion of the substrate (*FIG. 4, element 300*),

a gas supply (*FIG. 4, element 150 and 160*), configured and arranged to supply a gaseous to a space (*FIG. 4, element CA*) containing a mirror (*FIG. 4, element 201, 203, and 208*);

at least one sensor selected from the group comprising a reflectivity sensor to monitor a reflectivity of said mirror and a pressure sensor to monitor a background pressure in said space (*FIG. 4, element PSI*); and

a gas supply control, responsive to a signal from said at least one sensor to control said gas supply (*FIG. 4, element 402: The output of sensor PSI is inputted to CONTROL CIRCUIT 402 that outputs the signal 1 to control valve V1. Since either supply or discharge gas from the case CA affects the current amount of gas in the case CA, controlling the valve V1 to adjust the gas discharge is considered as controlling the current amount of gas in the case CA supplied from the gas source*).

Tanaka et al. does not disclose wherein the supplied gas is hydrocarbon such as alcohol or ethanol used to control a layer formed on the mirror which is a collector mirror, wherein the gaseous alcohol is supplied to said space at a pressure sufficient to achieve a thickness of said cap layer which does not increase substantially over time.

Klebanoff et al. suggests that in order to protect a surface of a component (such as a collector/multilayer mirror (*column 3, lines 50-54 and column 4, lines 10-20*)) exposed to or sputtered by a radiation source, a gas, typically a hydrocarbon such as alcohol, is introduced into the environment of the surface (*Abstract, column 3, lines 65-66, and column 4, lines 60-65*) to eliminate reactive oxygen species that could oxidize the surface and degrade its reflectivity (*column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 8*). In other words, such gas is used to control a layer formed

Art Unit: 2853

on the mirror, wherein the thickness of the layer does not increase substantially over time (*column 4, lines 37-49 and column 5, lines 1-20: The thickness is about 5A*) (**Referring to claims 7-9, 11-12, 15-16**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the gas supply source disclosed by Tanaka et al. to supply hydrocarbon gas as disclosed by Klebanoff et al. The motivation for doing so would have been to eliminate reactive oxygen species that could oxidize the surface and degrade its reflectivity as taught by Klebanoff et al. (*column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 8*).

Tanaka et al. also discloses the following claimed invention:

Referring to claim 2: wherein the radiation system contains said space containing the mirror (*FIG. 4, element 201, 203, and 208*).

Referring to claim 3: wherein the radiation system comprises one of a laser-produced plasma source and a discharge source adapted to supply a beam of extreme ultraviolet (EUV) radiation as said projection beam (*FIG. 4, element 100*).

Referring to claims 4-6: wherein said beam of extreme ultraviolet radiation has a wavelength of less than about 50nm, in the range of from 8 to 20nm, or from 9 to 16 nm (*column 42, lines 23-25*).

2. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. (EP 1020897 A1) in view of Klebanoff et al. (US 6533952), as applied to claim 10, and further in view of Duveneck et al. (US 6469785).

Tanaka et al., as modified, discloses the claimed invention as discussed above and also discloses wherein the method further comprises adapting the amount of gaseous hydrocarbon

Art Unit: 2853

supplied to the space such that at least part of at least a top layer of said minor undergoes sputtering. However, Tanaka et al., as modified, does not disclose wherein said mirror comprises at least 40 multilayers.

Duveneck et al. discloses a multilayer mirror that comprises of 40 sequenced layers in order to obtain high efficiency and high optical output (*column 9, lines 2-7 and lines 30-35*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to replace the mirror disclosed by Tanaka et al., as modified, by the one comprising of 40 layers as disclosed by Duveneck et al. The motivation for doing so would have been to obtain high efficiency and high optical output as taught by Duveneck et al. (*column 9, lines 2-7 and lines 30-35*).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/01/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First of all, the applicant argued that Tanaka et al. expressly taught against supplying hydrocarbon into the spaces in an optical system. It is the examiner's point of view that Tanaka even though teaches removing contaminants or foreign matter such as species of water vapor or hydrocarbon, Tanaka does not teach to prohibit from supplying hydrocarbon into the system. Similarly to Tanaka's teaching, Klebanoff et al. also teaches eliminating/removing of contaminants including species of hydrocarbon and water vapor (column 3, lines 32-35; column 6, lines 10-20), that is/are dissociated into reactive oxygen species during the radiation, by admitting a small amount of hydrocarbon gas (or ethanol) into the system (column 3, lines 50-66 and column 5, lines 34-40) to react with reactive oxygen species (or eliminate the reactive

oxygen species) on the substrate to form volatile products (column 3, line 50 to column 4, line 8).

Secondly, the applicant asserted that Klebanoff et al. did not teach or suggest a gas supply control responsive to a sensing/monitoring signal to control a layer formed on the mirror. As discussed above, Klabanoff et al. in combination with Tanaka et al. teaches such limitation.

Finally, the applicant asserted that Klebanoff et al. did not teach a thickness of a cap layer that did not increase substantially over time to affect the performance of the mirror. Klebanoff et al., in fact, teaches the thickness of the layer is only 5A (column 4, line 37 to column 5, line 10) that does not reduce much the reflectivity of the mirror.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAM S. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-2151. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM - 3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, STEPHEN D. MEIER can be reached on (571)272-2149. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

Art Unit: 2853

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lam Son Nguyen', written in a cursive style.

LAM SON NGUYEN